

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:  
WILLIAM H. DRUMMOND  
DRUMMOND & DUCKWORTH  
5000 BIRCH STREET  
SUITE 440 EAST TOWER  
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	03 MAR 2005
-------------------------------------	-------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference  344-P-47-PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
---	---

International application No.  PCT/US04/31963	International filing date (day/month/year)  28 September 2004 (28.09.2004)	Priority date (day/month/year)
---	--	--------------------------------

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
  
IPC(7): A61B 5/00, 5/05 and US Cl.: 600/407, 473, 476; 356/317

Applicant  
  
BRIDE, MARK

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I      Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II      Priority
- ☐ Box No. III      Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V      Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI      Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII      Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

#### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer <i>Sharon A. Greene for</i> Eleni Mantis Mercader Telephone No. 703 308-0858
--	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/31963

**Box No. I Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US04/31963

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

**2. Citations and explanations:**

Claim 1 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over DeBaryshe et al. US Patent No. 5,713,364.

DeBaryshe et al. '364 teaches a method for screening epithelial tissue by illuminating with a preselected wavelength (see Figure 8 and see col. 33, lines 43-52) to visualize abnormal sites (by detecting autofluorescence signals as indicated in col. 33, lines 54-50) and viewing through a filter blocking other wavelengths to enhance visualization (see col. 33, lines 54-col. 34, line 18). The detection wavelengths being somewhat different than the illumination wavelengths constitutes insubstantial difference since the same end result is achieved of detecting cancerous tissue in the epithelium.